

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, please note that Applicants are in the process of obtaining and forwarding a certified copy of priority document JP 2004-52802, since, apparently the priority document was not forwarded from the International Bureau. Thus, as requested by the Examiner, the certified copy will be forwarded as soon as possible.

Independent claims 1 and 3 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the reference relied upon in the rejection discussed below.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima (JP 2003-323150). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1 and 3 and claim 4 that depends therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a method including generating, during a sustain period, a sustain discharge by alternately applying sustain pulses to a scan electrode and a sustain of a discharge cell of a plasma display panel. Further, claim 1 recites that (1) a rise time of a sustain pulse applied to the scan electrode (during the sustain period) is shortened at a frequency of once every three times a sustain pulse is applied thereto, and (2) a rise time of a sustain pulse applied to the sustain electrode (during the sustain period) is shortened at a frequency of once every three times a sustain pulse is applied thereto. In addition, claim 1 recites that (3) sustain pulses, applied to the scan electrode and the sustain electrode between the sustain pulses having the shortened rise time, have a non-shortened rise time that is longer than the shortened rise time.

Finally, claim 1 recites that (4) a rise time of each of the sustain pulses having the non-shortened rise is the same. Kojima fails to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (1)-(4) as recited in independent claim 1.

Rather, Figure 4 of Kojima teaches that the rise time t_0 of only the first sustain pulse applied to the scan electrode 17Y is shortened. In addition, Figure 5 of Kojima teaches that the rise time t_0 of only the first sustain pulse applied to the sustain electrode 17X and the scan electrode 17Y is shortened. Moreover, Figure 6 of Kojima teaches that the rise time t_0 of only the first sustain pulse applied to the scan electrode 17Y is shortened, and teaches that the rise times t_{1a} , t_{1b} and t_{1c} applied to the sustain electrode 17X are longer than the rise time t_0 (i.e., $t_0 < t_{1a}$, $t_0 < t_{1b}$, and $t_0 < t_{1c}$) (see pulses 32a, 32b and 32c of Fig 6). Still referring to Figure 6, it appears that Kojima teaches that when rise times of the sustain pulse applied to the sustain electrode 17X are varied, the rise time of the sustain pulse applied to the scan electrode 17Y is longer than t_0 (see Fig. 6, wherein, when rise times t_{1a} , t_{1b} and t_{1c} are varied, the rise times of the sustain pulse applied to the scan electrode 17Y is longer than t_0).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Kojima teaches that the rise time t_0 of only the first sustain pulse applied to the scan electrode (see Figs. 4 and 5) is shortened, but fails to disclose or suggest that a rise time of a sustain pulse applied to the scan electrode is shortened at a frequency of once every three times, and a rise time of a sustain pulse applied to the sustain electrode is shortened at a frequency of once every three times, as required by claim 1. In other words, Kojima does not disclose or suggest that the sustain pulse applied to the scan/sustain electrodes is shortened at a frequency of once every three times, as required by claim 1, because Kojima merely identifies various patterns wherein the rise time of only the first pulse is

shortened. This shortening of the rise times at a frequency of once every three times is not an arbitrary design choice, but is a specific design choice selected by the applicants, which is neither disclosed or suggested by Kojima.

Additionally, for the same reasons discussed above, it is also evident that Kojima fails to disclose or suggest that the sustain pulses (applied to both the scan and sustain electrodes between the sustain pulses having the shortened rise times that are applied to both the scan and sustain electrodes) have a non-shortened rise time that is the same and that is longer than the shortened rise time, as recited by claim 1. Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claim 4 that depends therefrom would not have been obvious in view of Kojima.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kojima or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kojima to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claim 4 that depends therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

New independent claim 3 is directed to a method and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1 (e.g., sustain pulses having a shortened rise time are applied to both the scan and sustain electrodes in a specific manner). Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is allowable over Kojima.

Additionally, independent claim 3 recites that the rise time of the sustain pulse applied to the scan/sustain electrodes is shortened at a frequency of one of (i) once every two times and (ii)

once every three times, a sustain pulse is applied thereto.

Referring back to Kojima, it is clear that Kojima merely teaches that only the first pulse applied to a electrode can have a shortened rise time, and that the next two pulses applied to the electrode have a longer rise time.

Thus, in view of the above, it is evident that Kojima teaches away from shortening the rise time of the sustain pulse once every two times, as required by claim 1. Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 3 would not have been obvious in view of Kojima.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kunihiro MIMA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2008.11.24 15:08:39 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 24, 2008